

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAUREN LANKFORD,

Plaintiff,

v.

SOLANO CO. JUSTICE CTR., et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:23-cv-1759 SCR P

ORDER AND FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff, a county inmate, filed this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. §1983. On screening the complaint, the court found plaintiff stated no cognizable claims for relief. (July 24, 2024 Order, ECF No. 6.) The court dismissed the complaint with leave to file an amended complaint within sixty days. Sixty days have passed and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the July 24 order.

Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the July 24 order was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court apprised of their current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court IS HEREBY ORDERED to randomly assign a district judge to this case.

////

1 Further, IT IS RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for plaintiff's failure to
2 prosecute and failure to comply with court orders. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41; E.D. Cal. R. 110.

3 These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge
4 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty-one days
5 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections
6 with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings
7 and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified
8 time may result in waiver of the right to appeal the district court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951
9 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

10 DATED: October 2, 2024



11
12 SEAN C. RIORDAN
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28